APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/054,103	10/25/2001	Benjamin J. Parker	1689 (15724)	3674

33272	7590	05/20/2005

SPRINT COMMUNICATIONS COMPANY L.P.
6391 SPRINT PARKWAY
MAILSTOP: KSOPHT0101-22100
OVERLAND PARK, KS 66251-2100

EXAMINER
BATES, KEVIN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 March 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

Response to Amendment

This Office Action is in response to a communication made on March 17, 2005.

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Sitaraman (6427170) in view of Grant (5027269).

Regarding claim 1, Sitaraman discloses a method of managing user connection

sessions with a gateway in a computer network (Column 8, lines 23 – 28), said method

comprising the steps of: storing user data on said gateway in response authentication

by said user (Column 8, lines 23 – 28); storing user status information in a table in a

RADIUS server during times that an authenticated user session is established with said

gateway (Column 8, lines 29 – 38; Column 7, lines 8 – 12); deleting said user status

information from said table when said authenticated user session is terminated (Column

8, lines 32 – 38); said gateway routing said user traffic in response to said user data

(Column 7, line 65 – Column 8, line 12), but does not explicitly indicate detecting a

failure of said gateway wherein said stored user data is lost; said gateway sending a

request to said RADIUS server to provide said user status information and user data

corresponding to each user in said table; storing said user data on said gateway; and

said gateway routing said user traffic to continue said authenticated user session in response to said user data and said user status information without requiring re-authentication following said failure. Grant teaches a failure recovery system for network nodes, where the session state is published to another network node, like Sitaraman's system (Column 2, lines 38 – 42). Grant also teaches detecting a failure of said gateway wherein said stored user data is lost (Column 4, lines 42 – 51); said gateway sending a request to said server to provide said user status information and user data corresponding to each user in said table (Column 4, line 67 – Column 5, line 2); storing said user data on said gateway; and said gateway routing said user traffic to continue said user session in response to said user data and said user status information without requiring re-authentication following said failure (Column 5, lines 20 – 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Grant's teaching of network node recovery in Sitaraman's system in order to allow Sitaraman's system to recover from faults without having to re-establish the communication sessions that are active (Column 2, lines 21 – 30). Sitaraman also does not explicitly indicate that the gateway and the RADIUS server a running on separate machines, but Sitaraman discloses that the preferred embodiment has them on running on the same machine, but has different embodiments which they could be located on separate machines (Column 7, lines 7 – 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the gateway and RADIUS server on separate machines according to a possible

embodiment in Sitaraman's disclosure in order to allow restarting of systems in case of failure without affecting the RADIUS server (Grant, Column 2, lines 46 – 65).

Regarding claim 2, the combination of Sitaraman and Grant discloses that said user status information includes an IP address assigned to said user for said session (Sitaraman, Column 8, lines 35 – 38).

Regarding claim 3, the combination of Sitaraman and Grant discloses that said detecting step is comprised of a power-up initialization (Grant, Figure 2, element 100, 106, and 108).

Regarding claim 4, the combination of Sitaraman and Grant discloses said step of requesting said RADIUS server to provide said user status information and said user data is included in a boot-up sequence of said gateway (Grant, Figure 2, element 100, 106, and 108).

Regarding claim 5, the combination of Sitarama and Grant discloses that said user data comprises a host object (Column 9, lines 61 – 64) and a connection object (Column 9, line 64 – Column 10, line 6).

Regarding claim 6, the combination of Sitarama and Grant discloses that said step of storing user status information in the table is delayed until a connection object is created for said user (Column 11, lines 41 – 57).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sitaraman in view of Grant as applied to claims 1-6 above, and further in view of Zhang (6253327).

Regarding claim 7, Sitaraman does not explicitly indicate that said gateway is comprised of a service selection gateway. Zhang discloses a gateway coupled to an AAA server (Column 6, lines 5 – 15). Zhang teaches that the gateway should be a service selection gateway (Column 5, lines 23 – 32). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Zhang's teachings in Sitaraman's disclosure in order to use a protocol gateway that is able to give the client single sign in access to multiple domains and destinations (Column 5, lines 26 – 32).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed March 17, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, the applicant argues that the reference Sitaraman does not disclose having the RADIUS server and the gateway on separate machines. The examiner disagrees, the disclosure of Sitaraman indicates that they are preferably on the same machine, but that shows that there are alternative embodiment in which the server and gateway are located remote from each other (Column 7, lines 7 – 10).

Regarding claim 5, the applicant argues that the reference, Sitaraman does not indicate a user object and a connection object in the user profile. The examiner disagrees, the reference discloses storing information about the user such as login information and accounting information (Column 9, lines 61 – 64) and information on the current connection the user has such as the IP address allocated and whether the connection is active (Column 9, line 64 – Column 10, line 6).

Regarding claim 6, the applicant argues that the reference, Sitaraman does not indicate delaying storing the user object until the connection object is created. The examiner disagrees, the reference discloses temporary creating the user object while creating the connection object and authenticating the user, so that the connection object is running and the user is fully connected to the system once the user is fully authenticated and the user object is then finally removed from the temporary cache and stored officially (Column 11, lines 41 – 57).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Bates whose telephone number is (571) 272-3980. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KB
May 7, 2005

BHARAT BAROT
PRIMARY EXAMINER